

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims are rejected.

Claims 16-29 are currently amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 16-21 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the examiner asserts that the recited elements are non-statutory software components. The claims are currently amended to recite a statutory computer program recorded on computer readable media. Withdrawal of the rejections is therefore requested.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 1100013 (Maes). The recited invention is related to generation of scripts used in browser applications associated with document generation systems. Maes describes multimodal browsing and conversational markup language (CML). The Examiner cites Maes at paragraphs 0018, 0022 and 0108-0109 as describing all of the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 15 and 16. However, applicant is unable to find any similarities between Maes and the recited invention. As described in the background section of this application at pages 1-2, a document generation program generates an input form from a standard document in order to create a customized document. The input form is used to obtain information that is used to customize the standard document, and may take the form of a series of questions presented via a browser. However, relationships between different questions are so complex that the results of executing update functions triggered by a related question (triggering element) may be a function of the sequence in which those update functions are processed. Consequently, the input form script is typically hand-coded, which is costly and slow. The presently recited invention helps to automate the

script generation procedure by *constructing an activation network to determine an invocation sequence for interrelated elements such as questions*. More specifically, as described in the specification at page 12, lines 17-22, the sequence in which update functions are invoked (the invocation sequence) for each trigger element (question that affects other questions) is determined by a breadth-first expansion of the activation network. In this expansion, any acyclic path of length N from a first node X to a second node Y is expanded into a path of length N+1 from the first node X to a third node Z by appending a path of length 1 from the second node Y to the third node Z. Figure 3 illustrates an example of an acyclic activation network.

Turning now to claim 1, the first recited element is “supplying update functions to a synthesizer.” As described at page 9, lines 12-13, an “update function” reacts to a change of the value of an element (question) by updating other elements (related questions) of the input form. As described at page 21, lines 24-28, the “synthesizer” converts the form description, validation functions and update functions generated by a form generator into a description and script suitable for interpretation by a form renderer such as a web browser. The corresponding paragraph cited from Maes (0018) describes translating between different forms of markup language. Even if the translation described by Maes were equivalent to the recited synthesizer, which it is not, Maes fails to describe the update functions which are the source of the problem.

The second element recited in claim 1 is “identifying trigger elements from the elements of the form in the update functions that trigger the invocation of the update function.” In other words, the questions that affect update functions are identified. The corresponding paragraphs cited from Maes (0018 and 0022) describe translating between different forms of markup language and altering presentation of a CML page. Again, Maes fails to describe either the

update functions which are the source of the problem or identifying the questions that trigger those functions.

The third and fourth elements recited in claim 1 are “generating an activation network based on the update functions at the synthesizer” and “determining the invocation sequence of update functions for each trigger element.” The corresponding paragraphs cited from Maes (0018, 0022 and 0108-0109) describe translating between different forms of markup language, altering presentation of a CML page, and CML gestures. Having failed to describe even the basic features associated with generating a script for customizing a standard document from an input form, Maes necessarily fails to anticipate the recited solution of generating an activation network based on the update functions at the synthesizer to determine the invocation sequence of update functions for each trigger element.

Independent claims 15 and 16 recite limitations which correspond to the limitations of claim 1. In view of the above it will be appreciated that Maes actually fails to teach or suggest any of the features recited in the independent claims, and does not even share the same general subject matter. The dependent claims are not anticipated for the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejections is therefore requested.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 30, 2009  
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/  
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Anderson Gorecki & Manaras LLP  
33 Nagog Park  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 760-022  
Dd: 07/01/2009